California into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed vegetable substance, in that a large proportion of the oranges were frosted, and 60 per cent of them exhibited marked drying in 20 per cent or more of area.

On April 7, 1919, the San Antonio Fruit Exchange, Pomona, Cal., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned that the product should be resorted under the supervision of a representative of this department, such portion as might be found fit for manufacture into jelly and marmalade to be released to said claimant for that purpose, and the remainder to be destroyed or denatured.

E. D. Ball, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

7206. Misbranding of Prescription 1000. U. S. * * * v. 57 Packages of Drugs Labeled in Part "Prescription 1000." Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 9954. I. S. Nos. 7907-r, 7908-r. S. No. C-1131.)

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the Prescription 1000 Internal consisted essentially of a slightly alkaline emulsion of copaiba, flavored with methyl salicylate, and that the Prescription 1000 External consisted essentially of a dilute aqueous solution of potassium permanganate.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the labels on the packages bore and contained false and fraudulent statements, designs, and devices regarding the curative and therapeutic effect of the article.

On June 3, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. Ball, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

7207. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Giuseppe Crisafulli and Stefano Crisafulli (Crisafulli Bros.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 9957. I. S. Nos. 13726-r, 13727-r.)

On July 17, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Giuseppe Crisafulli and Stefano Crisafulli, copartners, trading as Crisafulli Bros., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on October 10, 1918, and June 21, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of quantities of an article, labeled in part "Table Oil * * * Extra Fine Olive Oil," together with designs showing olive tree and branches with olives, and the statement in inconspicuous type, "Corn salad oil compound with." Said article was adulterated and misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed it to consist essentially of cottonseed oil and corn oil. In the shipment of October 10, 1918, the average volume of 6 cans of the so-called ½-gallon size was 0.48 gallon, and that of 6 cans of the so-called ½-gallon size was 0.24 gallon.

Adulteration of the article in the shipments was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, a mixture of cottonseed oil and corn oil, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower, reduce, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article in the shipment of October 10, 1918, was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Table Oil * * * Extra Fine Olive Oil." together with the designs on the label showing olive branches with olives and an olive tree, not corrected by the statement in inconspicuous type, "Corn salad oil compound with," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article was olive oil, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not, but was a product consisting essentially of a mixture of corn oil and cottonseed oil, and for the further reason that the statement, to wit, "Net Contents Half Gallon" or "Net Contents One Quarter Gallon," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that each of said cans contained \frac{1}{2} gallon or \frac{1}{4} gallon of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was olive oil, and that each of said cans contained & gallon or ½ gallon of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not olive oil, but was a product consisting essentially of a mixture of corn oil and cottonseed oil, and each of said cans did not contain & gallon or & gallon of the article, but contained a less amount; and for the further reason that it was a product composed essentially of a mixture of corn oil and cottonseed oil prepared in imitation of olive oil, and was sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, olive oil. Misbranding of the article in the shipment of June 21, 1918, was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Table Oil * * * Extra Fine Olive Oil," together with the designs on the label showing olive branches with olives and an olive tree, not corrected by the statement in inconspicuous type, "Corn salad oil compound with," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article was olive oil, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was olive oil, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not, but was a product consisting essentially of a mixture of corn oil and cottonseed oil; and for the further reason that it was a product composed essentially of corn oil and cottonseed oil prepared in imitation of olive oil, and was sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, olive oil.

On July 23, 1919, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

E. D. Ball, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

7208. Misbranding of cucumbers. U. S. * * * v. Percy M. Chaddock. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 9960. I. S. No. 5846-r.)

On July 31, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Michigan, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Percy M. Chaddock, South Haven, Mich., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about September 23, 1918, from the State of Michigan into the State of Illinois, of a quantity of cucumbers which were misbranded.